

## **REMARKS**

### **Status of the Claims**

Prior to entry of this paper, Claims 1-33 were pending. In the Final Office Action issued November 28, 2011, Claims 1-33 were rejected. In this paper, Claims 1, 10, 22, 28, 31, 32, and 33 are amended; no claims are cancelled; and no claims are added. Claims 1-33 are currently pending. No new matter is added by way of this clarifying amendment. For at least the following reasons, the Applicants' representative respectfully submits that each of the now pending claims is in condition for allowance.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claim 32 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,308,703 B2 (hereinafter "Wright") and further in view of Knouse et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,185,364 B2 (hereinafter "Knouse") and Basu et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,836,888 (hereinafter "Basu").

After reviewing in combination the cited portions of Wright, Knouse, and Basu and the arguments presented in the Office Action Applicants' representative disagrees with the Office Action's allegations that the cited portions of Wright, Knouse, and Basu viewed in combination fail to disclose or render obvious at least amended independent Claim 32. However in the interest of brevity and expediting the allowance of these claims, independent Claim 32 is amended for clarity as follows:

employing a virtual sandbox at the client device to encrypt the resources using an encryption key that is separately stored on a remote server device

Support for this clarifying amendment is found throughout the Specification, including at least on Page 15, lines 27-28.

The Applicants' representative agrees with the Office Action's admission that the combination of Wright and Knouse "does not disclose employing a virtual sandbox at the client device to encrypt the resources using an encryption key that is stored on a remote server device." See, Office Action, Page 5, para. 2, lines 1-2. Likewise, for at least the same reasons the combination of Wright and Knouse fails to disclose or suggest employing the virtual sandbox at the client device to encrypt the resources using an encryption key that is separately stored on a remote server device as recited by amended independent Claim 32.

Furthermore, the cited portions of Basu appear to disclose a password key for encrypting files on the reverse sandbox that is stored in a special file in the user's home directory on the local standalone host. See, Basu, Col. 13, lines 14-19. Clearly, the cited portions of Basu fail to disclose employing the virtual sandbox at the client device to encrypt the resources using an encryption key that is separately stored on a remote server device as recited by amended independent Claim 32. In particular, the cited portions of Basu fail to disclose encrypting the resources using an encryption key that is separately stored on a remote server device. Instead, the encryption key disclosed in the cited portions of Basu appears to be stored locally on the client device (standalone server) in such a way that "no mechanisms for securely distributing keys over remote networks [are] required." See, Basu, Col. 13, lines 19-20. Thus, the Applicants' representative submits that the cited portions of Wright, Knouse, and Basu, either singly or in combination fail to disclose or render obvious each and every limitation of amended independent Claim 32. Therefore, the Applicants' representative requests that the rejection of amended independent Claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

Claims 1-2, 4-11, 13-18 and 20-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright and further in view of Shah et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,430,524 B2 (hereinafter “Shah”) and Knouse, and Basu.

After reviewing in combination the cited portions of Wright, Knouse, Shah, and Basu and the arguments presented in the Office Action Applicants’ representative disagrees with the Office Action’s allegations that the cited portions of Wright, Knouse, Shah, and Basu viewed in combination fail to disclose or render obvious at least amended independent Claim 1. However in the interest of brevity and expediting the allowance of these claims, independent Claim 1 is amended for clarity as follows:

employing the virtual sandbox at the client device to encrypt the resources using an encryption key that is separately stored on a remote server device

Support for this clarifying amendment is found throughout the Specification, including at least on Page 15, lines 27-28.

The Applicants’ representative agrees with the Office Action’s admission that the combination of Wright, Knouse, and Shah “does not disclose employing a virtual sandbox at the client device to encrypt the resources using an encryption key that is stored on a remote server device.” See, Office Action, Page 9, para. 2, lines 1-2. Likewise, for at least the same reasons the combination of Wright, Knouse, and Shah fails to disclose or suggest employing the virtual sandbox at the client device to encrypt the resources using an encryption key that is separately stored on a remote server device by amended independent Claim 1.

Furthermore, the cited portions of Basu appear to disclose a password key for encrypting files on the reverse sandbox that is stored in a special file in the user’s home directory on the local standalone host. See, Basu, Col. 13, lines 14-19. Clearly, the cited portions of Basu fail to disclose employing the virtual sandbox at the client device to encrypt the resources using an encryption key that is separately stored on a remote server device as recited by amended independent Claim 1. In particular, the cited portions of Basu fail to disclose encrypting the resources using an encryption

key that is separately stored on a remote server device. Instead, the encryption key disclosed in the cited portions of Basu appears to be stored locally on the client device (standalone server) in such a way that “no mechanisms for securely distributing keys over remote networks [are] required.” See, Basu, Col. 13, lines 19-20. Thus, the Applicants’ representative submits that the cited portions of Wright, Knouse, Shah and Basu, either singly or in combination fail to disclose or render obvious each and every limitation of amended independent Claim 1. Therefore, the Applicants’ representative requests that the rejection of amended independent Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

Furthermore, independent Claims 10, 22, 28, and 31 are somewhat similar to independent Claim 1 and have also been amended similarly. Thus, for at least the same reasons as amended independent Claim 1 the Applicants’ representative requests that the rejection of amended independent Claims 10, 22, 28, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

Moreover, since dependant Claims 2, 4-9, 13-18, 23-27, and 29-30 depend from one of amended independent Claims 1, 10, 22, and 28 each of these dependent claims is allowable for the same reasons as the respective independent claims from which they depend. Also, since the separate rejections of these dependent claims are now moot in view of the reasons presented for the respective independent claims upon which they depend, a further refutation of those rejections is not provided here. However, the absence of such a further refutation of the rejections of the dependent claims in no way should be construed as an admission of the legitimacy of the rejections, but rather it is in the interest of brevity and expediting the allowance of these claims that a more detailed discussion is not provided at this time. Therefore, the Applicants’ representative requests that the rejection of Claims 1-2, 4-11, 13-18, and 20-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright, Knouse, Shah, and Basu, as applied to Claim 10 above, and further in view of Ishikawa, U.S. Patent No. 7,200,272 B2 (hereinafter “Ishikawa”).

Although the Ishikawa reference may disclose a program which serves as a cache manager runs to delete the user's cache data, the suggested combination of this reference with the Wright, Knouse, Shah, and Basu references does not cure their deficiencies. Furthermore, at least because dependant Claim 19 depends from amended independent Claim 10 this dependent claim is allowable for the same reasons as independent claim 10 from which it depends. Also, since the rejection of this dependent claim is now moot in view of the reasons presented for the independent claim upon which it depends, a further refutation of the rejection is not provided here. However, the absence of such a further refutation of the rejection of dependent claim 19 in no way should be construed as an admission of the legitimacy of the rejection, but rather it is in the interest of brevity and expediting the allowance of this claim that a more detailed discussion is not provided at this time. Therefore, the Applicants' representative requests that the rejection of Claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

Claims 3 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Wright, Knouse, Shah, and Basu, and further in view of Levine, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0111852 A1 (hereinafter "Levine").

Although the Levine reference may disclose determining the type of client device and whether it's a cell phone, kiosk, PDA, laptop, desk computer, terminal or any other access device, the suggested combination of this reference with the Wright, Knouse, Shah, and Basu references does not cure their deficiencies. Furthermore, at least because dependant Claims 3 and 12 depend from one of amended independent Claims 1, and 10, each of these dependent claims is allowable for the same reasons as the respective independent claims from which they depend. Also, since the separate rejections of these dependent claims are now moot in view of the reasons presented for the respective independent claims upon which they depend, a further refutation of those rejections is not provided here. However, the absence of such a further refutation of the rejections of the dependent claims in no way should be construed as an admission of the legitimacy of the rejections, but rather it is in the interest of brevity and expediting the allowance of these

claims that a more detailed discussion is not provided at this time. Therefore, the Applicants' representative requests that the rejection of Claims 3 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

Claim 33 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright and further in view of Levine, Knouse, and Basu.

After reviewing in combination the cited portions of Wright, Levine, Knouse, and Basu and the arguments presented in the Office Action Applicants' representative disagrees with the Office Action's allegations that the cited portions of Wright, Knouse, and Basu viewed in combination fail to disclose or render obvious at least amended independent Claim 33. However in the interest of brevity and expediting the allowance of these claims, independent Claim 33 is amended for clarity as follows:

employing the virtual sandbox at the client device to encrypt the resources using an encryption key that is separately stored on a remote server device

Support for this clarifying amendment is found throughout the Specification, including at least on Page 15, lines 27-28.

The Applicants' representative agrees with the Office Action's admission that the combination of Wright, Levine, and Knouse "does not disclose employing a virtual sandbox at the client device to encrypt the resources using an encryption key that is stored on a remote server device." See, Office Action, Page 22, para. 6, lines 1-2. Likewise, for at least the same reasons the combination of Wright, Levine, and Knouse fails to disclose or suggest employing the virtual sandbox at the client device to encrypt the resources using an encryption key that is separately stored on a remote server device as recited by amended independent Claim 33.

Furthermore, the cited portions of Basu appear to disclose a password key for encrypting files on the reverse sandbox that is stored in a special file in the user's home directory on the local standalone host. See, Basu, Col. 13, lines 14-19. Clearly, the cited portions of Basu fail to disclose employing the virtual sandbox at the client device to encrypt the resources using an encryption key

that is separately stored on a remote server device as recited by amended independent Claim 33. In particular, the cited portions of Basu fail to disclose encrypting the resources using an encryption key that is separately stored on a remote server device. Instead, the encryption key disclosed in the cited portions of Basu appears to be stored locally on the client device (standalone server) in such a way that “no mechanisms for securely distributing keys over remote networks [are] required.” See, Basu, Col. 13, lines 19-20. Thus, the Applicants’ representative submits that the cited portions of Wright, Levine, Knouse, and Basu, either singly or in combination fail to disclose or render obvious each and every limitation of amended independent Claim 33. Therefore, the Applicants’ representative requests that the rejection of amended independent Claim 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

It is respectfully submitted that each of the pending claims is now in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' representative at the below-listed telephone number if it is believed that the prosecution of this application may be assisted thereby. Although only certain arguments regarding patentability are set forth herein, there may be other arguments and reasons why the claimed invention is patentable. Also, the Applicants' representative reserves the right to raise these arguments in the future.

It is believed that no further fees are required for this Amendment. However, should the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office determine that additional fees are owed or that any refund is owed, the Commissioner is hereby authorized and requested to charge the required fee(s) and/or credit the refund(s) owed to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Dated: January 30, 2012

Respectfully submitted,

By: /john w branch/

John W. Branch

Registration No.: 41,633

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

745 Fifth Avenue

New York, NY 10151

(206) 336-5669

(212) 588-0500 (fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant